

**SITE REVIEW WRITTEN STATEMENT
RESPONSE TO STAFF REVIEW OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2009**

DATE: January 4, 2010

PROJECT NAME: The Armory

REGARDING: Site Review Response to Staff Comments
of September 25, 2009

LOCATION: 4640 TABLE MESA DRIVE & 555 TANTRA DRIVE

REVIEW TYPE: BVCP Land Use Designation Change, Rezoning & Site Review

REVIEW NUMBER: LUR2009-00061 (Land Use Map Change & Rezoning) & LUR2009-00062 (Site Review)

APPLICANT: FOUR STAR REALTY

DISCUSSION: Below is the original Staff Commentary from September 25, 2009 with the Applicant's
Written Response shown below each individual item in bold text.

**ARMORY OVERVIEW STATEMENT
SITE REVIEW**

Since the Staff Comments were issued on September 25, 2009, a significant number of improvements have been incorporated into the Armory Project. The primary change to the site design is the introduction of public rights-of-way for two of the streets serving the project. Along with public streets, tree lawns have been added to separate the sidewalks from the edge of street. Utility connections to the buildings have been paired to maximize space for street trees in these tree lawns.

The Armory site continues to be a transitional zone with compatible single family homes positioned along the west property line, adjacent to the existing Martin Acres neighborhood, transition to medium density residential on the eastern 2/3rds of the site. The developer is requesting RM-1 Zoning over the entire site along with the dedication of public streets. The overall density will be reduced from 41 units to 37 for a 10% reduction in density to approximately 7 units per acre gross.

The introduction of public streets required the entrance drive be lowered approximately 4 feet. This lowering of the street, and adjacent site, now requires 555 Tantra Drive to be used for a detention pond surrounded by open space and landscaping. Two affordable Paired Home units on this site have therefore been relocated. These affordable units have been incorporated into the three buildings that comprise the Row Homes.

Three buildings, including two, tri-plexes and one, six-plex are now planned for the Row Home buildings. This configuration allows for vehicular access from the main east west street, thus removing traffic from the street serving the single family units. Redesign of the Row Homes into three buildings reduces the overall mass of these structures with 6 units in one building where 7 were planned. The second Row Home building has been redesigned into two tri-plex buildings. Also, when the street ROW was added, the Row Homes were moved 12 feet further north, or closer to Table Mesa, a move supported by the adjacent neighbors.

At the south end of the street serving the single family units, a 50 foot diameter turn around is planned to meet current transportation standards. This street continues around the east side of the central circle as a private street, also 26 feet wide with guest parking along one side. Tree lawns have been added to both sides of the private street. The great majority of the multi-family traffic will use the main entry drive and the eastern side of the looped street, thus shifting this traffic further away from the adjacent Martin Acre neighbors to the west.

Actively used Open Space has been focused at the north end of the site and now wraps around the east end of the Row Homes to include the Pin Oak Plaza and the main north to south pedestrian path through the site. The Pin Oak Plaza incorporates special pavement and landscaping, benches, bike racks, a mature Pin Oak tree and the original Armory plaque from the building. This plaza is also connected to a large open play field incorporated into the main detention pond. Above the 100 year flood level, and west of the play field, is the Community Gardens used by the residents of the Armory project. The original flag pole that served the Armory has been incorporated into the Gardens. The former central plaza, in the middle of the circle, has been converted to an open grass area

with a centrally located mail kiosk and gazebo roof structure.

The main north to south pedestrian path has been relocated to the east side of the site, better connecting the bus stop on Table Mesa to the Pin Oak Plaza, on-site Open Space and the school site. This path has been widened to 8 feet where it is not adjacent to a street. In the revised location, this path has fewer street crossings and less conflicts with on-site traffic. The connection shown to Summit School, near the Parks and Recreation Building, in the south east corner of the site, was the preferred connection supported by the adjacent single family neighbors and the School District

Below is the Written Response to Staff Comments from September 25, 2009, shown below each individual item in bold text.

STAFF COMMENTS

CITY OF BOULDER LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: September 25, 2009
CASE MANAGER: Karl Guiler
PROJECT NAME: The Armory
LOCATION: 4640 TABLE MESA DRIVE & 555 TANTRA DRIVE
COORDINATES: S03W02
REVIEW TYPE: BVCP Land Use Designation Change, Rezoning & Site Review
REVIEW NUMBER: LUR2009-00061 (Land Use Map Change & Rezoning) & LUR2009-00062 (Site Review)
APPLICANT: FOUR STAR REALTY

DESCRIPTION: **1) BOULDER VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (BVCP) LAND USE MAP CHANGE:** Request to change the BVCP land use map designation from Public to Medium Density Residential. *An alternate proposal has been submitted that would designate the western portion of the property as Low Density Residential.*

2) REZONING: Request to rezone the property from RL-1 (Low Density Residential – 1) to RM-1 (Medium Density Residential – 1). *An alternate proposal has been submitted that would leave the western portion of the property as Low Density Residential (RL-1) zoning.*

3) SITE REVIEW: Request for approval to redevelop the existing Army Reserve Training Center site with a variety of residential housing types (e.g., row houses, duplexes, and single family homes) totaling 41 units (including nine permanently affordable units). The units would be accessed off of Tantra Drive with fire/emergency access off of Table Mesa Drive. *An alternate proposal, consistent with those discussed above, would consist of 37 units (including seven permanently affordable units).*

4) VESTED RIGHTS: Pursuant to Section 9-2-19, B.R.C. 1981, the applicant is also requesting approval of vested rights to allow a start date within five years of approval of the development.

REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS FROM THE LAND USE REGULATIONS:

1. 9-9-2(b), B.R.C. 1981- Maximum Permitted Buildings on a Lot (request for more than one in RM-1).
2. 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- Reduction of 20-foot front yard setback along Table Mesa to 15 feet.
3. 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- Parking within the required 20-foot landscaped setback.
4. 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- Option A, SFD 15-feet from rear lot line where 20 feet required.
5. 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- Encroachment of deck into rear setback. (13 or 14 foot distance proposed).

Add the following modifications:

1. 9-7-1, B.R.C.- Reduction of 20 foot front yard set back at single family homes.
2. 9-7-1, B.R.C.- Reduction of side yard set back of 1 foot per 2 feet of building height between Paired Homes and Row Homes and along dedicated ROW.
3. 9-7-1, B.R.C.- Reduction of 20 foot front yard set back at Row Homes.
4. 9-7-1: Rear yard set back to a property line behind the Paired Homes.

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Overall, staff finds that there are numerous aspects of the project (i.e., compact form, diversity of housing types, affordable housing, sensitive infill etc.) that are consistent with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) such that a change in land use from public to medium density residential for all or part of the lot would be substantiated. At this time, staff has not concluded the analysis of whether the project would meet the BVCP land use map change criteria listed in Section V. Complete consistency will depend upon the ultimate design of the plans revised per the design and code compliance issues discussed throughout this document. Staff will also await the revised materials to evaluate the proposed rezoning to RM-1.

Some of the larger design alterations requested to meet code criteria and standards are listed below:

1. Public right-of-way: Provision of public right-of-way through portions of the site (See the 'Access/Circulation' and 'Land Uses' sections below). Staff is open to zoning the entire site RM-1 if it adds flexibility in meeting this requirement.
2. Sidewalks and tree lawns: Provision of detached sidewalks and tree lawns along the public rights-of-way (See 'Access/Circulation,' 'Landscaping' and 'Site Design' comments below). Staff is open to relaxed standards for tree lawns and sidewalks on portions of the site that would not be within public right-of-way.
3. Garages and shared driveways: Reorientation of garages away from streetscape and use of shared driveways to minimize the visual impact of garages and better accommodate the pedestrian in the development. (See 'Building Design,' 'Site Design', and 'Access/Circulation' comments below.) Staff is open to setback modifications that may add flexibility in meeting these alterations.
4. Open spaces- Consideration of relocating open spaces on site to make them more useable and functional. (See 'Site Design' and 'Landscaping' comments below).

Aside from these most key issues above, staff finds that a majority of the Site Review criteria could be met with this project. Staff understands the complex relationship between meeting the requirements listed within this document and would be happy to meet with the applicant to discuss the comments and assist in meeting code criteria and standards. To set up a meeting, please contact the Case Manager, Karl Guiler, at 303-441-4236.

Please review and address all comments in this document and submit 10 revised review sets and written responses to the comments to the Project Specialists within 60 days. If submittal is not possible in that time frame, please inform the Case Manager of the reason for delay. If the applicant demonstrates that there is a good faith reason for the delay and that work is continuing on addressing the comments, the City Manager may extend the review time. If no review sets are received in this time and the applicant does not contact the Case Manager, the project will be considered withdrawn.

Questions regarding process and zoning related items should be forwarded to the Case Manager (Karl Guiler, 303-441-4236). Otherwise, specific questions about reviewer comments should be forwarded to the specific reviewer identified in each section.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

Access/Circulation (Michelle Mahan, 303-441-4417)

1. The proposed single family homes would seem to be best served by public streets which would be consistent with home owner expectation of street maintenance adjacent to single-family homes and also consistent with how other single-family developments throughout the city are served. Staff would recommend dedicating a 60 foot wide public right-of-way which runs east-west into the site and a 60 foot wide public right-of-way which runs north-south along the frontage adjacent to the proposed single-family homes. Access to the multi-family homes could remain via a private driveway as is often the case for that type of unit.

A revised Site Plan has been submitted with a 60 foot public right-of-way running east to west that serves the multifamily portions of the site and a 48 foot wide right-of-way running north to south in front of the Single Family units. The right-of-way as shown is located 6 inches from back of walk for clearance for construction.

2. The diagram in the traffic impact study illustrates modifications to the existing traffic island in Tantra Drive. These proposed modifications must be shown and dimensioned on the site plans at this time.

A revised painted traffic island has been added to the Site Plan. A detail of the island is shown in the Drawings.

3. The proposed modifications to the traffic island in Tantra Drive must be supported by the traffic impact study. Revise the traffic impact study to include a queuing analysis of northbound Tantra at the intersection of Table Mesa in order to verify the functionality of the proposed access during peak hours.

A revised painted traffic island has been added to the Site Plan and a detail of this island is included with the Drawings. The Traffic Study addresses the impact this project has on the Tantra Drive and Table Mesa intersection.

4. The traffic impact study should be revised to include the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies consistent with the submitted TDM plan.

The Traffic Demand Management study has been addressed in the revised Traffic Study.

5. The traffic impact study references existing traffic data as the year 2002 and must be clarified. All raw traffic data must be no more than 2 years old and must be factored up to current year numbers supportable by the traffic model in the Transportation Master Plan. Revise the study accordingly.

Current traffic counts were taken since the last application and the Traffic Study has been revised to include the lower traffic counts.

6. Per section 9-2-14(h)(2)(D) of the Boulder Revised Code, Site Review applications must demonstrate a significant shift away from single-occupant vehicle use to alternate modes through the use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies. As GO Boulder staff previously discussed with the applicant, provision of transit passes for the residents of the site appears to be the most efficient approach to meeting this requirement. If residential transit or eco passes are proposed as part of the final TDM plan, a financial guarantee will be required prior to building permit application. See the attachment regarding recommended revisions to the TDM plan.

The developer will encourage the Homeowners Association to work with the residents to provide Eco Passes, if this is approved by the HOA.

7. The Grading Plan must be revised to clearly label and dimension the proposed transit improvements. A 6x13 shelter pad and shelter should be installed behind the sidewalk and aligned with the front of the bus pad. The plans are required to show and dimension this bus pad, shelter pad, shelter, and the associated tree grates. The existing bus shelter may be relocated or a new shelter installed. A public access easement will be required to be dedicated for any portion of the bus pad/shelter that is located outside of the public right-of-way.

A detailed plan of the Bus Shelter has been added to the Drawings. Since Table Mesa Drive has concrete pavement, the bus pad in the street will not be required. Most of this information is construction level detailing. An easement can be provided.

8. All rights-of-way and easements are required to be dedicated concurrently with the final engineering submittal and prior to the time of building permit. All rights-of-way and easements required to be dedicated to the city must be reviewed and approved through a Technical Document Review application. Application materials and requirements are located on the 3rd Floor of the Park Central Building, and can also be found on the city's web-site at: www.bouldercolorado.gov

Comment acknowledged.

9. The city is was previously interested in constructing a photo enforcement vehicle parking space along the property's Table Mesa frontage. However, after further investigation and data collection, a deployment location is not necessary at this time. The proposed "bump-out" shown along the Table Mesa frontage should be removed from the plans.

Comment acknowledged. The radar van pull out has been eliminated.

Emergency Access/Circulation

10. The access area between RH10 and RH11 exceeds 150 feet and requires a turn around to be installed for emergency vehicles. The turnaround dimensions should be in conformance with Figure D103.1 of the 2006 International Fire Code. The applicant should coordinate with Fire Protection and revise the plans accordingly.

The revised Site Plan was submitted to the Fire Department and during this review it was determined a Fire Lane would suffice at the west end of the internal drive serving the Row Home complex.

11. The plans must be revised to show and label fire approved bollards to be installed at the secondary emergency access. Revise the plans accordingly.

Fold down bollards, as approved by the Fire Department, have been noted where Fire Lanes connect to public rights-of-way.

12. All access/circulation through the site will be required to provide adequate clearance for emergency vehicles. Generally, a minimum 14 foot wide clear width exclusive of on-street parking is necessary for emergency vehicles, along with a SU-30 compliant turning radius. Revise the plans to include the appropriate "no parking fire lane" signage.

Areas where on-street parking is allowed have been indicated with a hatch pattern along one side of the street and is shown on the Site Plan. A 26 foot wide street section is planned with parallel parking along one side only,

leaving sufficient room for the 14 foot minimum emergency vehicle clearance and the radius corners meet the minimum criteria for the SU-30 turning radius.

13. Per Section 2.10 of the DCS, emergency access lanes must be entirely contained within a minimum, continuous 20 foot wide emergency access easement or public right-of-way. Vertical clearance from the surface of the emergency access lane must be at least 15 feet. Revise the plans to clearly illustrate and dimension all required emergency access easements.

Comment acknowledged. Two Fire Lanes are shown on the Site Plan.

Sight Obstructions

14. Revise the Landscape Plans to clearly illustrate and dimension all required sight triangles. All driveways must have an unobstructed sight triangle measured as 15 feet along the edge of the driveway and 15 feet along the public right of way line, with a line connecting these two lines. Exceptions are made for trunks of trees whose branches are higher than 8 feet above the roadway, objects less than 30" tall, or objects that are no less than 75% visually permeable. The Site Review plans must show the trees/shrubs in conformance with this standard.

The Landscape Plan shows all required sight triangles and all landscape materials are in compliance within the triangles.

15. Revise the Landscape Plans to clearly illustrate and dimension all public street intersection sight triangles in accordance with Table 9-8 of the Boulder Revised Code.

The Landscape Plan shows all required sight triangles per Table 9-8 and all landscape material are in compliance within the triangles.

Pedestrian Connectivity/Circulation

16. The portion of sidewalk which ties into the north/south pedestrian connection to the Boulder Valley School District site should be widened to 5 feet in order to adequately accommodate the additional pedestrian traffic. A public access easement extending one foot beyond the edges of walk, should be provided for this north/south connection. Revise the plans accordingly.

A revised pedestrian path extending north to south through the project has been incorporated into the Site Plan. This path has been relocated to the east side of the project to better connect the bus stop on Table Mesa to the southeast corner of the site, which could continue through the school property to the front door of the school building. An easement can be provided for the path.

17. All attached sidewalks internal to the site should be replaced with detached sidewalks with 8 foot wide landscape buffers.

Sidewalks have been detached from the edge of street wherever possible. Ten foot wide tree lawns are shown, where possible, along the 60 foot ROW and 6 foot wide tree lawns are shown adjacent to the single family street and the private street, around the south and east sides of the looped street. Around the 50 foot diameter turn around, the sidewalks remain attached to simplify the geometry of the intersecting drives.

18. Clearly label and dimension the proposed 4 foot wide sidewalk and an 8 foot wide landscape buffer along the Tantra property frontage, on the Grading Plan.

Dimensions requested have been noted as "match existing conditions" on the Site Plan. A new walk is shown aligned with the existing walk, on the adjacent property north of 555 Tantra, where the landscaped strip is smaller than 8 feet.

Vehicular Drive Access

19. The applicant should continue to pursue the possibility of relocating the duplex access shared with the adjacent veterinary clinic to be taken from the internal site access drive. If the grading causes architectural design issues, a preliminary sketch outlining the concerns should be submitted to and discussed with city planning and engineering staff.

The Paired Home at 555 Tantra was removed, therefore access to the Veterinary Clinic will not be affected. The portion of the driveway that serves 555 Tantra Drive will be removed.

20. Revise the site plan to incorporate shared driveways in the locations where the drive cuts are less than the required 15 foot separation (Paired Homes 13-16 and 19-20) in order to decrease pedestrian conflicts and the amount of paved surface.

Decreased curb cut widths have been shown at all of the Paired Homes. Since shared drives would require an increased drive length, to navigate around cars parked in front of garage doors, and therefore an increased pavement surface area, a smaller width curb cut has been shown in place of shared drives. A minimum of 15

feet of separation was not possible at all driveway due to the use of Paired Homes in the design. Five foot wide landscaped buffers are shown between driveways at side by side Paired Home units. Driveways at Single Family Homes and Paired Homes have been reduced to the width of the garage doors, or 18 feet, the minimum width allowed for two parked cars.

21. The Grading Plan must illustrate and dimension the driveway grade requirements outlined in Table 2-2 of the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards to be met. Revise the plans accordingly.

The Grading Plan indicates compliance with Table 2-2. Driveway maximum and minimum grades are listed on the Grading plan.

22. The plans must be revised to show curb returns for all proposed public streets and standard drive cuts (per City of Boulder standard detail 2.21) for all proposed private access drives. Revise the plans accordingly.

The Site Plan has been revised to show the required drive cuts. The drive cuts are aligned on opposite sides of the 60 foot ROW.

23. The existing drive cut on Table Mesa must be clearly labeled to be removed per current city standards.

The removal of the existing curb cut on Table Mesa is noted on the Grading Plan.

24. Per section 9-9-6(d)(3)(B) of the Boulder Revised Code, turnaround spaces must be provided for dead-end parking bays of eight stalls or more. Revise the plans to include a turnaround space for Buildings 10 and 11. Turnarounds must be identified with a sign or graphic and marked "no parking". All required turn-around spaces must be clearly labeled and dimensioned.

The geometry and depth of the Fire Lane between Row Homes Number 10 and 11 will allow for a turn around.

25. The backing distances for Buildings 10 and 11 must be clearly dimensioned on the plans.

Row Homes Number 10 and 11 are separated by 34 feet to allow for adequate backing distances. Dimensions have been added to the Site Plan.

26. Clearly dimension all parking spaces on the plans.

All parking spaces have been dimensioned on the Site Plan. The only parking space required includes one space provided adjacent to the east side of Row Home No. 11. Additional guest parking, not required by Land Use Regulations, is provided with parallel spaces along the street.

Affordable Housing Michelle Allen, Housing Planner 303-441-4076

Requirement: Chapter 9-6.5, B.R.C. 1981, "Inclusionary Zoning" requires that 20% of all new residential development be permanently affordable to low income households, with a variety of options available to satisfy that requirement, including on-site units, cash-in-lieu, or off-site units.

Proposal: Applicant's proposal is to fulfill the full affordable housing obligation on-site, with 9 of the 41 units as deed-restricted permanently affordable homes (22% of the affordable units provided on-site). Option B has 7 of 37 units as deed-restricted permanently affordable homes and a cash-in-lieu contribution of .4 of a unit (19% of the affordable units provided on-site). Either of these options would satisfy the required number of units. Both options address the City's general preference for on-site permanently affordable units whenever possible.

The revised proposal includes 37 dwelling units with a total of 7 affordable units. Two affordable units were removed at 555 Tantra, since the public ROW grading limitations depressed the site, thus a detention pond was required to replace the structure at this location. These two affordable units were then relocated to the revised Row Home buildings, in the middle of the tri-plex structures.

Distribution of Unit Types: The permanently affordable units must be composed of different unit types and distributed throughout the development. The Applicant's proposal indicates the intention that the on-site affordable units will be in varying configurations and located throughout the complex, which could meet the requirement.

Affordable units types remain distributed throughout the project. One Single Family unit is located at Single Family No. One to fit between existing mature trees. Four affordable units are included in three Row Home buildings and 2 units are provided in Paired Home No. 17.

Size Requirements: Applicant has been advised that there is a minimum size requirement for permanently affordable units. For attached units the average floor area of permanently affordable units needs to be a minimum of 80% of the average floor area of the market rate units up to a 1,200 square foot maximum. For detached units the average floor area of permanently affordable units needs to be a minimum of 48% of the average floor area of the market rate units up to a 1,200 square foot maximum.

The size of the affordable units exceeds this requirement.

Cash-in-lieu Applicant's proposal option B has 7 of 37 units as deed-restricted permanently affordable homes leaving 40% of a required affordable unit contributed as cash-in-lieu. Amounts are calculated, for the calendar year 2009, at \$119,922.35 per each required affordable detached unit \$110,177.70 per each required affordable attached unit.

Comment acknowledged. The Armory Project continues to incorporate 7 affordable units with an overall density of 37 units, with cash-in-lieu paid for a partial unit, or 0.4 units.

Agreements: A "Determination of Inclusionary Zoning Compliance Form" must be signed by both the applicant and housing planner prior to any development approval. Covenants to secure the permanent affordability of the units must be signed made prior to application for building permits. Any applicable cash-in-lieu contribution is due upon building permit issuance.

Comment acknowledged.

Building Design Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

1. Please provide details on fencing and wall designs within the development. It appears that fencing would screen the visible parking within the required landscape setback along Table Mesa. Please confirm.

Fencing along Table Mesa is designed to be a visual screen between the street and the Armory project. This solid fence is also intended to reduce the road grime and ice treatment from spreading to the garden areas. Since the deicing chemicals are spread during the winter non-producing months, the garden soils have a sufficient time to be diluted before the planting season begins.

Fencing details have been added to the Landscape Plan. A variety of fence types are planned due to the various locations where fencing will be needed.

2. Staff appreciates the proposed designs and variety of housing types within the development, which appear to take into account the surrounding context on both sides of the development. These attributes combine well to meet the majority of the Site Review Building Design criteria. However, additional information and modifications are required in order to meet criteria related to solar siting and streetscape as discussed below:

Solar Siting- In order to assess general consistency with section 9-2-14(h)(2)(G), B.R.C. 1981 with respect to shadowing within the development, a plan showing shadows of the proposed structures at 10am, 12pm, and 2pm must be submitted. This plan need not be to the same detail as those solar plans already submitted, but should give a general idea of what shadowing is expected based on the proposed building locations. This plan and the revised solar plans requested under the 'Zoning' comments below shall be incorporated into the larger plan set.

Since the property will remain one lot, without subdivision, the Solar Access limitations of Section 9-9-17 apply to the surrounding properties that abut the site, but not to the Armory project itself. The affected neighboring properties have been analyzed using Solar Access Area I for properties to the west of the site and Solar Access Area II for properties to the east of the site. These detailed studies are included with the full size drawings. A simpler shadow study for 10:00, 12:00 and 2:00PM is incorporated into the final drawings. A review of this Shadow Study shows there are days of the year where some of the buildings shade other structures on this site, however, this is limited in duration and the roof scape is completely unshaded to allow for the installation of active solar collectors. Second floor windows are never shaded and these are the primary living levels of the Paired Homes. Some shading is allowed at the lowest level or garage level of the Paired Homes No. 15 and 16 and the Row Home No. 10. The south walls of the Single Family Homes have partial shade, however, the second floor south facing wall and the entire roof is exposed for full solar collection. The Shadow Study for the overall site indicates the roof plan of each structure. Between 1,200 and 1,300 sq. ft. of south facing roof is designed for each of the four Single Family model homes. The Project will offer active solar collector systems as an option with the purchase of the homes. Both the Row Homes and Paired Homes incorporate flat roof sections for installation of solar collectors.

Streetscape- Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(v), B.R.C. 1981, states, "*buildings present an attractive streetscape, incorporate architectural and site design elements appropriate to a pedestrian scale, and provide for the safety and convenience of pedestrians.*" Although staff finds the upper levels of buildings consistent with this criterion in regard to their variation of building forms, colors, and fenestration, the prominence of garage doors along the entirety of the streetscapes would greatly detract from the pedestrian experience. In order to meet this criterion, staff has the following recommendations:

- a. Shared driveways for the single-family homes such that garages would be pulled back from the streetscape and reoriented in a north-south orientation towards the back of residences. This would eliminate the appearance of garages along the street.

The concept of shared driveways was considered, however, we have designed the single family homes with living spaces on the south side for a passive solar orientation, therefore, the garages need to stay on the northeast corner of each Single Family Home. Shared driveways would reverse the orientation of 50% of the homes and have them face north, therefore this was not considered. The concept of garages in the rear yard was studied during the Concept Review phase of this project. This idea was rejected due to adjacent neighbors concerns, the difficulty of constructing the garage into the existing rear yard on the sloped site, additional paving, undermining of the power lines and disruption of existing established vegetation. The width of driveway pavement has been reduced to the actual width of the doors to minimize paved surfaces.

Garage door appearance has been modified by the addition of full width front porch roofs, that cover and conceal the visual impact of the double wide garage doors. Only garages that are concealed below a full width porch roof are shown with a double wide door. A door design that incorporates glass panes in a paneled design have been added to mitigate the overall scale of the door. Some garage doors have been broken into two separate doors and some have a 2 foot off-set so one of the doors is not in alignment with the front of the living space. One model of home has been redesigned with a half width porch roof that covers one garage door, while the second is off-set and recessed by 2 feet. In general, more detail has been added to show that the garage doors are not detracting from the front elevation.

- b. Reorientation of garages for duplexes in a similar manner with narrowed shared entries like those suggested under comment #7 of the 'Site Design' comments below.

During Concept Review Paired Homes No. 15 and 16 faced each other to share the driveway and orient garages away from the street, similar to Paired Homes No. 17 and 18. During the Concept Review hearing the Planning Board requested that these units face the street in an effort to reduce the pavement area. These units were reoriented and the pavement area actually decreased. None of the other units on the site can be rotated and still fit in the site area that is available. Therefore, the garage doors have been modified to have two smaller doors per garage. Offsets of 2 feet are offered on the garage elevation of each building. The second floor decks have been wrapped around the garage elevation to shade the garage doors and cover up this building element and make this wall more recessive when viewed from the public sidewalk. The garage door includes glass panes in a paneled design to reduce the overall scale of the doors.

- c. Driveway access to Paired Housing unit #12 from site entry drive instead of from Tantra Drive and relocate garages to the west side of the structure.

Introduction of the 60 foot wide ROW serving the site resulted in lowered grades and therefore, 555 Tantra Drive (formerly Paired Home No. 12) was required to be replaced by a detention pond. These two affordable units were relocated to the Row Homes. The existing driveway that serves the veterinary clinic will remain untouched by the project development. Asphalt paving that served the existing home at 555 Tantra Drive will be removed and converted into a detention pond and landscaping.

- d. Reorientation of the garage access to Paired Housing unit #14 so that the pedestrian pathway is not interrupted by two driveways.

Orientation of the drive way for Paired Home No. 14 has remained facing south, since the building is designed with living spaces on the south side for passive solar collection. A conflict with the pedestrian path was mitigated by relocating the main north to south pedestrian path. Re-orientation of the two Paired Homes inside the circular drive was investigated, however, the rotated units would have almost no private rear yard space, therefore, there was an additional incentive for the homeowner's interest to have these two units placed as shown.

Drainage (Steve Buckbee, 303-441-3279)

1. An outlot or a drainage easement is required for the proposed detention pond. If right-of-way is dedicated for the streets and a subdivision is made, we will require the former, otherwise an easement will do.

Rights of way are required, so the ponds will need to be in an outlot.

2. The detention pond cannot encroach into the utility easement along the east property line revise the pond design as necessary.

The pond is located outside of the utility easement.

3. The duplex along Tantra and the access road need to be delineated as a drainage basin and included in the drainage report. Revise the drainage report and make sure you are meeting the requirements outlined in section 7.12 (C) of the City of Boulder Design & Construction Standards.

The duplex has been removed. This area is now a detention pond and it is factored into the revised analysis.

4. Urban Drainage has updated the values in Table 7-2 for runoff coefficients. Feel free to use the City's table or the updated version available on the UDFCD.org website.

The duplex has been removed. This area is now a detention pond and it is factored into the revised analysis.

5. Show the emergency overflows for the two sumped inlets and the detention pond on sheet MDP1.

They are shown on the revised plan.

6. The proposed garden is located below the detention pond's 10 year water surface elevation. That means that every growing season there will be a 10% chance of inundation and possible garden destruction. Also, fertilizers and top soil in the garden have the potential to cause unique maintenance problems in the detention pond. Provide a section in the drainage report that explains how the garden will be operated and what special maintenance and best management practices will be needed to ensure that the garden and detention pond can function effectively together.

The proposed Community Gardens have been elevated such that the gardens are out of the 100 year floor storage. A 6 foot tall solid privacy fence will separate the Gardens from Table Mesa Drive. A section has been added to the Drainage Report regarding this.

7. Provide any available soils or environmental studies as part of the required revision.

The environmental studies were submitted with the first application for Site Review.

Fees

Please note that 2009 development review fees include a \$131 hourly rate for reviewer services following the initial city response (these written comments). Please see the P&DS Questions and Answers brochure for more information about the hourly billing system.

Comment acknowledged.

Fire Protection David Lowrey, 303.441.4356

No comments.

Land Uses Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

BVCP Land Use Map Change

Overall, staff finds that there are numerous aspects of the project (i.e., compact form, diversity of housing types, affordable housing, sensitive infill etc.) that are consistent with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) such that a change in land use from public to medium density residential for all or part of the lot would be substantiated. At this time, staff has not concluded the analysis of whether the project would meet the BVCP land use map change criteria listed in Section V. Complete consistency will depend upon the ultimate design of the plans revised per the design and code compliance issues discussed throughout this document.

The arguments for revision to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan remain as were originally stated in the first submittal for Site Review, and are repeated below.

From the early 1960's, the Armory has been a Public use dedicated to the storage and maintenance of military vehicles and army reserve equipment. Building space was also provided for a training center, a shooting range and administrative offices. While an active Army Reserve Base, the troops were on site every weekend and all of the vehicles were started and left running on Saturday mornings. Long time neighboring residents still remember a cloud of diesel fumes migrating from this site. In recent years the Army determined this site was not compatible with the Army Reserves needs and location relative to the front range demographics.

When the Armory was built in 1961, the Martin Acres neighbor hood was developing to the west of the site. Land south and east of the site was undeveloped with the PUD for the Tantra medium density housing site, which includes the Cross Creek Shopping Center, being approved in 1978. When the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, the Public Use designation was given to the site to match the current use as an Army Reserve Base. Areas around the Armory developed and medium density residential was built northeast, east and southeast of the site while a school and a city park were built south of the site.

Now that the Army has moved on to other base locations, a need for a re-zoning is required to redevelop the site.

To bring the site into compatibility with the built out surrounding area, a medium density transition zone will be established that places compatible single family homes next to established neighbors to the west, and then transitions to RM-1 medium density along the east side to match the existing medium density zone. As designed, this site will be a transition zone separating two different existing residential densities.

Since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted the need for affordable housing was identified and added as a goal to the plan. The need for affordable housing lead to the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. With re-zoning to RM-1, more affordable units are offered which meets the goals of the Comp. Plan and meets the Inclusionary Zoning requirements. With 37 total units, 7.4 units are required to be affordable. Seven are proposed to be constructed with the balance of 0.4 units to be paid for with cash-in-lieu.

Being located adjacent to Table Mesa Drive, the Armory offers the benefit of increased residential densities located on a multi-modal corridor. Increased residential densities also are helpful in reducing the Job/Housing imbalance. The convenience of this location will increase use of alternative transit options and the proximity to the mass transit is consistent with another Comprehensive Plan goal. The project includes a variety of housing types in a compact setting with an efficient use of the land where street size is minimized to allow for open space. The home designs are focused on passive solar collection and energy efficiency by building orientation and compactness of building up and not out to cover more land mass. The single family homes are shown to be compatible with the established Martin Acres neighbors and incorporate similar roof slopes, exterior materials, exterior colors and they meet the Compatible Neighborhood ordinance. A significant grade drop down into the Armory site at the west side also offers the neighbors a visual screen to the lower level of the new homes providing an improved natural buffer between existing and new neighbors.

In conclusion, the Armory project meets the Comprehensive Plan goals which include the desire for increased residential densities adjacent to major transit corridors, diversity in housing types, affordable housing, more housing in Boulder to offset the Jobs/Housing imbalance, and establishment of transition zones to separate zoning of differing densities.

Public Rights-of-Way

As raised during the Concept Plan review, staff felt that public rights-of-way within the development would be a benefit to the site's residents, since residents would not have to be responsible for street maintenance and for the reasons articulated in the 'Access/Circulation' comments above. Although private circulation is not uncommon for multi-family attached housing as condos, private circulation for condo single-family homes is an atypical condition that concerns city staff. This is because there have been situations in the past where homeowners of single family homes were unsatisfied with HOA street maintenance and down the line, end up requesting public rights-of-way within established developments. Further, post-facto subdivisions have also been requested by such owners, since such owners desire the same level of property purview as other single family owners throughout the city. These potential requests create complications with creating lots and streets that meet current city standards and can potentially lead to nonconforming situations that the city would prefer to avoid. Therefore, staff's position is that as a condition of the rezoning and with the intent of creating a development that is consistent with other city developments and the BVCP, public rights-of-way should be integrated into the development.

Staff proposes that in order to limit impact to the current development scheme, a 60-foot wide right-of-way in a T-configuration be used. This would put right-of-way over the access drive from Tantra Drive and along the street in front of the single-family homes, but would avoid impacting the areas with the concentration of attached housing, which could be served by a private access drive. Staff has estimated that the development could still retain enough open space outside of rights-of-way to support 37 units as proposed in Option B. This would be possible if the entire site were zoned RM-1, which the city is open to as long as single-family homes would be held to RL-1 and Compatible Development standards as part of the Site Review.

Having public right-of-way in front of the single-family homes would also create the potential for subdivision to create single-family homes on individual lots like typical single-family neighborhoods. This could potentially increase the marketability of those units as well. Staff is open to some setback modifications to the fronts of buildings and minimum lots sizes in order to make this option possible. Staff is open to discussion on this issue and welcomes questions. Should the applicant like to discuss this issue with Planning and Engineering staff, please contact the case manager, Karl Guiler, at 303-441-4236 to set up a meeting.

The Armory project is planned as a condominium development on one lot, that is not subdivided. Subdivision of the site, which has been a concern of Staff, is not possible given the unit owners do not own any of the land surrounding the condominium units.

After meetings with Staff to review the options of adding public rights-of-way, these were inserted into the project. A 60 foot ROW runs east to west to connect the multifamily units to the project entrance off of

Tantra Drive. A 48 foot ROW runs north to south to serve the Single Family units. A private street extends around the south and east sides of the central circle. Re-design of the Row Homes into multiple buildings has allowed vehicular access from the east to west street to minimize the width of the right-of-way in front of the single family units. Even with public rights-of-way, the project remains one non-subdivided lot with condominium units for all of the residential units. With the addition of public streets and dedicated rights-of-way, the re-zoning of the entire site to RM-1 Zoning is requested.

Incorporated into the drawings is an analysis to show that the Single Family condominium units meet the limitations of the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance. Since the Single Family condominium units are not located on actual individual lots, assumed lot line locations have been shown with rear and side yard set backs meeting RL-1 Zoning. The Typical Single Family Site Plan meets the requirements of the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance. Side yard set backs have been determined from the limitations of the Compatible Neighborhood ordinance. A variance is requested for the front yard set back of several Single Family condominium units, as dimensioned on the Site Plan.

Landscaping Elizabeth Lokocz 303.441.3138

Staff appreciates the numerous comments made at Concept plan review that have been addressed. Outstanding issues include the following:

1. Staff previously commented on the possibility of exploring detached sidewalks with an adjacent tree planting strip. Several design issues support this configuration which should be further explored: 1) adequate canopy space for large maturing trees (some are too close to proposed buildings; 2) shading of streets and sidewalks; 3) improved streetscape and pedestrian connections.

Street trees have been selected from the City of Boulder's street tree list for the appropriate width of the tree lawn in which they are located.

2. In support of the Site Review criteria of section 9-2-14(h)(C), the interior private loop road should be treated as if it was a street for street tree planting purposes. Given that as a goal, the proposed trees do not meet minimum spacing of one every 40 feet on center for large maturing trees per section 9-9-13 BRC 1981. The Landscape requirements table should also separate the required street trees from overall site landscaping which will no longer meet minimum requirements.

Utilities have been adjusted to allow for the appropriate number of street trees for the width of the tree lawn area.

3. The narrow planting strips between the driveways of the paired houses are inadequate to support trees. Enlarge them to be a minimum of 6 feet wide and preferably 8 feet to support healthy trees. This may require a more creative approach to driveway locations, widths, tapering etc.

Planting strips between driveways at the Paired Homes have been increased to 5 feet in width. This is the maximum possible separation of driveways possible given the overall width of the garages that these drive serve. A smaller strip is provided at Paired Home No. 14 due to the restrictions of the street design and the 50 foot diameter turn around.

4. Staff previously commented on the location of the community gardens. Although staff remains very supportive of incorporating a garden space into the development, the proposed location continues to be detached from the community and in less than an ideal location with road noise, light and pollution. If Option B is preferred, the resulting open area on the east side of the site would be a better location. In either option, locating the community gardens in the central open area would be an ideal integration and likely to see much more use than a formal plaza area. Some elements of the plaza (formal planting beds, benches, etc.) could be incorporated into the greater community garden design.

This open space is now L-shaped and wraps around the Row Homes to incorporate the Pin Oak Plaza into one larger, more useable concentrated open space area. It is now a gateway to the main north to south pedestrian link through the project. The Community Gardens area will incorporate a community gathering area, with shade structure, seating boulders, grape vines, fruit trees, berry patches and cut flower gardens for the pleasure and use of the residents. The area also preserves the flagpole, an historic reminder of the original use of the property. As designed, the flag pole will not require relocation to be a part of the Community Gardens concept.

5. Provide a preliminary plant list at the next submittal including quantities for all proposed trees. Quantities for all other plants are not needed until the final submittal.

A plant list has been provided including quantities of all proposed trees.

6. The Requirements table shall be updated to include the correct code references of section 9-9 Development Standards.

The code references have been revised to reflect the correct section of the Development Standards.

7. Gravel mulch may be used in limited areas. Indicate on the plan where it is proposed and see section 9-9-12(d)(10) for specific limitations. Note that in our climate it is extremely difficult to achieve full plant coverage with stone mulch and decreased spacing (increased plant quantities) are usually needed.

The code references have been revised to reflect the correct section of the Development Standards.

8. The proposed parking/drive area between the proposed townhouses should be designed to accommodate larger planting areas, trellis structures with climbing vines and other treatments to provide shade and aesthetic appeal. The planting areas shown are likely to become maintenance issues given their small size and high water demand. This would be an ideal area for pervious block pavers or another type of pervious paving.

The code references have been revised to reflect the correct section of the Development Standards.

9. Revise the proposed grading plan to incorporate preservation of existing trees, in particular the 24" Pin Oak in the northeast corner. Indicate on the grading plan, or a separate plan how existing trees are to be protected during construction, reference protection requirements of the Design and Construction Standards Chapter 3 and provide any of the required Design and Construction details available at www.bouldercolorado.gov.

A tree preservation map and details are provided with the landscape submittal. The grading plan is set up to preserve the trees that are to remain on the site.

10. Coordinate all proposed utilities with existing and proposed trees. The utility and landscape plans shall be cross referenced to include trees (existing and proposed) on the utility plans and utilities (existing and proposed) on the landscape plans. It appears that the water and sewer services can be located such that additional street tree planting opportunities can be made.

Utilities have been adjusted to allow for the appropriate number of street trees for the width of the tree lawn area. Utilities are shown on the landscape plan.

Legal Documents Julia Chase, City Attorney's Office, Ph. (303) 441-3020

Development Agreement

1. Prior to signing the Development Agreement, if approved, the Applicant shall provide the following:
 - a. An updated title commitment current within 30 days; and
 - b. Proof of authorization to sign on behalf of the owner.

Vested Rights

The maximum length of a vested right that can be granted at the Planning Board level is three years. An applicant is entitled to this three year period if it meets the requirements of § 9-2-19, B.R.C. 1981. Any amount longer than that has to be approved by the City Council as an ordinance. See § 9-2-19(e), B.R.C. 1981. The decision of the City Council to approve a vested right beyond three years is a decision that is legislative in nature.

Comment acknowledged, Owner is requesting an extension to the standard three year period.

Please note that the applicant may request a phased development plan that meets the requirements of § 9-2-12, B.R.C. 1981 that extends beyond a typical three year approval without requesting a vested right beyond the three year period. As phasing is included in the request, staff requests that the applicant submit a phasing plan showing the proposed phases with labels as to when each phase is intended to begin and end.

Due to the current difficulties with financing housing project s, and the uncertain economy, the developer is requesting an extension to start the project up to 5 years from approval of the Site Review. Current lending practices require each phase of development to be 70% pre-sold before a mortgage can be approved for sale for that particular phase. Due to this current lending restriction, the construction of each building will be considered a phase of the project. The developer anticipates that lending practices may change in the 5 year extension to the start of the project and then more than one building would be included in each phase.

A preliminary schedule is as follows:

- **Site Review Process**
- **Technical Documentation**

Complete first quarter 2010
Complete end of 2010

- **Site work, utilities, public improvements** **Complete end of 2015**
- **Start first phase of buildings** **Subject to financing availability or up to 5 years after final approval**

Build out of the project will be dependent upon lending available at that time.

Neighborhood Comments Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

Several phone and email inquiries about the development were received. However, no written or verbal comments about the development have been received. A neighborhood meeting held by the applicant is scheduled for Tuesday, October 6, 2009 is scheduled at the Meadow Branch Library at 6pm.

Neighbors adjacent to the Armory site, that live along the east side of 46th Street, submitted a letter of concerns to the developer in early November, 2009. As a result of their requests, the landscaping has been modified to include additional screening trees that will be planted west of the single family homes. Additionally, the chain link fence that separates the property from the neighboring rear yards will be developed as a "living screen wall" with the addition of vines and other planted materials. To develop these plants for the future, the developer plans to install the plant materials and temporary irrigation during the next growing season, therefore, these plant materials will be better established for the future when the single family units are constructed.

The under grounding of the power lines was investigated, however, it was determined that this is not feasible. Since these lines are a regional distribution system, there is no splicing of the line at any intermediate point. Therefore, the entire line would need to be replaced from start to end point, if any section of the line was placed below the surface.

At Concept Review, the developer requested 41 total units. As revised, the Armory project includes 37 units, therefore, the density has been reduced by 10%. At the Concept Review in 2006, there was a street running parallel to the west property line serving duplex units. With the current design, single family units back up the Martin Acres neighbors and the rear yard set back meets the limitations of the RL-1 Zone. These revisions have been made to increase compatibility with the adjacent neighbors.

Redesigning the Paired Homes with a limit of 2 stories was not found acceptable since the Open Space requirement is established at 3,000 s. ft. per unit. Shorter, two story units would occupy a much larger surface area of the site and the required Open Space couldn't be provided. There is one Paired Home that is designed to be 2 stories in height and this is an affordable unit where the useable square footage was reduced to make this possible.

Plan Documents Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

1. The fence referenced by SF#2 is now shown on the site plans. Please revise.

The Landscape Plan includes revised fence locations and options for the fence types proposed.

2. Revise the Site Development Plan to show the driveway access to the existing Veterinarian building.

Access to the veterinarian clinic has been restored to the existing curb cut. The shared drive that serves 555 Tantra Drive will be removed when the site is cleared for the installation of the detention pond.

Site Design Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

1. Indicate how the proposed fire lane will be closed to traffic from Table Mesa. Will bollards or a gate be used? If so, please provide a detail of the bollards, gate, etc.

The Fire Lane that connects to Table Mesa has been redesigned to have two strips of concrete pavement where the fire truck wheel tracks would be located. Three, fold down bollards are installed so that either concrete path can be used for pedestrian or bicycle access. The Fire Lane has been designed to be a custom extension of the pedestrian paths that follow both the sides of the street serving the Single Family Homes. With the pedestrian paths commingled with the Fire Lane, more landscaping was allowed to fit between the paved areas.

2. In the written statement, it is stated that a 6-foot tall privacy fence and landscaping will be installed to mitigate any potential noise issues from the adjacent Parks and Recreation facility. Please include diagrams and/or more information on the plans that demonstrate this.

A fence detail for the 6 foot privacy fence, adjacent to Parks and Recreation maintenance yard, is shown on the Landscape Plan.

3. Staff commends the applicant's overall design of open space within the development. However, in order to make the open spaces more functional and useable per section 9-2-14(h)(2)(A)(i), B.R.C. 1981, staff has the following recommendations that may be required at time of presentation to Planning Board:
 - a. Consider relocating the proposed community gardens to the central open space location or to the east of the row house buildings to better insulate the space from traffic noise and contaminants in the soil in proximity to Table Mesa.

Due to the desire to use the Gardens as a buffer to the Table Mesa corridor, grading requirements and the best location for the detention pond, the Community Gardens of the Armory project need to remain as shown, adjacent to the Table Mesa at the northeast corner of the site. The Gardens are separated from the street with a 6 foot tall privacy fence, much similar to the remainder of the Table Mesa thoroughfare, to mitigate the impact of the adjacent street on the area. A soils test has been submitted showing there are no known soils contaminants that would impact the use for Gardens. The Gardens have been raised to an elevation above the 100 year water storage level of the detention pond. Areas are planned for maintenance path ways for Garden access, planting areas, and an area set aside for the existing Flag Pole that has historically served the Armory. To the East of the Gardens, an open grass play field is left for open play, thus providing an active use for the detention pond.

The Gardens and associated open space are also interconnected to the relocated Bus Stop along Table Mesa and it is linked to the main north to south pedestrian path through the Armory site, connecting it to Summit School. This open space wraps around Row Home No. 10, incorporating Pin Oak Plaza where the existing mature Pin Oak is saved. This detailed Plaza incorporates benches, landscaping, special paving and the historic Armory Plaque recycled from the building. South of this pedestrian Plaza, the 8 foot wide multi-use path continues south into the center of the project, and then continues as a 5 foot wide path along the street towards the school.

- b. Consider relocating the central formal plaza space to the east side of the row houses in proximity to the Pin Oak tree to be preserved. Staff finds that the formal space would provide an integral passive open space amenity to the development that may be more functional if located in proximity to the community gardens, so long as the space is not located too close to the noise and traffic of Table Mesa.

The central plaza feature (formerly in the center of the circular drive between Paired Homes No. 13 and 14) has now been incorporated into the Pin Oak Plaza. This area has been expanded around the Row Home buildings, includes the Pin Oak Plaza and continues south to the main entry drive in the site via the main pedestrian path. The Pin Oak Plaza is located over 90 feet south of Table Mesa but still visible to the Bus Stop along Table Mesa. This open space area also has a direct connection to the Row Home entries. The former location of the central plaza is now a more passive green space area, with the mail kiosk located on the east side.

- c. Consider using the central space as a common greenspace for more active recreational uses. A simple open greenspace at that location with perimeter benches and perimeter plantings would likely be more functional at that location than the formal plaza space currently proposed.

The central plaza feature has been simplified to be an open landscape area, mostly of open lawn space. A pedestrian walk bisects this open space for equidistant access from the single family homes. The central walk location also has a better likelihood of being used and has improved privacy separation from the rear yards of adjacent Paired Homes. Along the east side there will be an open air pavilion to cover the central mail kiosk. The mail kiosk will also serve as an information center for the Armory Project.

4. It has not been demonstrated that the landscaping on the site would exceed the "Landscaping and Screening Standards" and "Streetscape Design Standards" of section 9-9-13 and 9-9-14, B.R.C. 1981. Exceeding the landscaping standards is a requirement of section 9-2-14(h)(2)(C)(iii), B.R.C. 1981. Please refer to the 'Landscaping' comments above on how to better meet this Site Review criterion.

The Landscape Plan now exceeds the overall tree and shrub requirements of the city standards. The proposed landscape materials exceed the minimum standards both in evergreen height and ornamental tree caliper.

5. The 'Landscaping' comments suggest the redesign of the streetscape within the development to have detached sidewalks and tree lawns consistent with today's standards for streets. Whether or not the internal streets are public or private, this change would add landscaping to the development to better meet the criterion referenced above and would be a requirement to create more attractive streetscapes within the development. In order to fully meet criterion 9-2-14(h)(2)(C)(iv), B.R.C. 1981, which states, "*the setbacks, yards, and useable open space along public rights-of-way are landscaped to provide attractive streetscapes, to enhance architectural features, and to contribute to the development of an attractive site plan,*" staff will recommend this to the Planning Board.

Tree lawns have been added with the conversion of the private streets to public rights-of-way. Along the main entry drive 10 foot wide tree lawns are provided with 6 foot widths along the smaller streets and the private drive. Utility connections to the buildings have been grouped together allowing more street trees to fit the overall site. Adequate tree lawns, minimizing the widths of drive ways as they meet the street, shared driveways and adjustment to the utilities has allowed the site to accommodate the required number of street trees.

6. Until such time that a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan is approved, it cannot be concluded whether criteria 9-2-14(h)(2)(D)(iv) and (v), B.R.C. 1981 are met.

The Traffic Demand Management plan has been addressed in the Traffic Study. Revisions to the site plan include a stronger linkage of the Bus Stop on Table Mesa to the dominant north to south pedestrian path way on the Armory site and the main open space feature, the Pin Oak Plaza.

7. Staff does not find that the project would be consistent with the Parking criteria of section 9-2-14(h)(2)(E), B.R.C. 1981. This is because there are a significant number of curb cuts along the internal drives that interrupt the convenience of pedestrian movements and detract from the appearance of the streetscape. To make for a more safe and attractive streetscape, staff finds that vehicular access to units should be narrowed down as much as possible by combining access points and narrowing vehicular entries. This would reduce the amount of curb cut interruptions along the streets, which would enhance pedestrian safety (see criterion (E)(i) relating to safety) and would add to the level of landscaping enhancing appearance (see criterion (E)(vi) relating to landscaping for parking areas). For instance, access to duplex units could be narrowed down to one shared access point between the units, rather than two completely independent driveways to each that results in an excess amount of paving (see (E)(iv) relating to amount of land devoted to parking). As discussed in the 'Building Design' section, staff is also suggesting shared driveways for the single-family homes. Given the prevalence of pavement along the streetscape, staff would also recommend the use of pavers or patterned driveways to enhance visual interest and minimize the visual impact of asphalt and concrete. Staff would be happy to meet with the applicant to discuss ideas to meet these criteria.

Parking areas are located on the lowest level of the proposed buildings allowing for living space construction above them. This incorporation of garages within the building foot print reduces the amount of site area required for parking. Garages will house 73 of the required 74 cars in the Armory project, improving the streetscape view. Garages will be less disruptive to the site than having the equivalent number of surface parking spaces. Driveway widths have been reduced to the minimum width that still allows for cars to maneuver around parked cars in a shared drive way and to the minimum width needed to serve the garage door, or 18 feet, whichever was smaller. Driveways to Units 17 and 18 as well as Units 19 and 20 have been reduced to 12 feet in width. Driveway widths were also reduced at Units 13, 14 19, and 20. Reduction of the curb cut widths, combined with the tree lawns along all of the streets, and shared driveways has improved the separation of parking from the streetscape.

Improved pedestrian pathways are shown with the dominate north to south pedestrian way only crossing a street once. By relocation to the east side of the project, this path only crosses 5 driveways where it previously crossed 9 driveways and two streets. The street width has been reduced from 28 feet to 26 feet, thus eliminating 7% of the street pavement surface. A shared driveway is planned for Paired Home No. 20 and Single Family Home No. 9. Shared driveways are provided at Paired Homes No. 17 and 18 and Single Family Homes No. 1 and 2. Twelve Row Home units share one access point off of the main east west drive. With the redesigned streets only the Single Family Homes and one Paired Home have driveways served by the 48 foot street ROW in front of the Single Family Homes, thus reducing the traffic impact on this western street. Almost all of the multifamily traffic is now served by the east side of the looped street and the main 60 right-of-way connecting to Tantra Drive, for an improved separation of traffic from the established Martin Acres neighborhood.

Shared driveways are not possible at the Single Family Homes with the focus on the living space at each Single Family Home, oriented to the sun, with maximum solar windows on the south elevation. The private yard space, the porch and the living areas of all Single Family Homes are oriented to the south and the sun. This would not be achieved with shared driveways. The living space of each home

is directly connected to the front porch on the southeast corner of the home. Front porches help to provide an attractive streetscape to the pedestrian.

8. Also, another improvement to enhance pedestrian safety consistent with the criteria discussed above, a curb or some sort of separation must be provided between the proposed pedestrian link and the driveway to single-family unit #9.

With the relocation of the main pedestrian path to the east side of the site, this issue has been eliminated by separating the path from adjacent driveways by an open landscaped strip. Fences, where shown, are separated by a minimum of 18 inches from the path. An easement can be provided for the path. If the School district does not allow for an actual connection to the school, the developer would prefer to provide the easement, but not the path, since it would dead end into a privacy fence on the property line with the school site.

9. Staff recommends that, if possible, the primary north-south pedestrian pathway have a minimum width of 5 feet.

The relocated north to south pedestrian path has been revised to be a minimum of 5 feet of width along streets with a wider, 8 foot path used in other locations.

Utilities (Steve Buckbee, 303-441-3279)

1. Show the proposed and existing water and sewer mains along the east property line on the Landscape plans. There appear to be at least 6 tree conflicts where the required 10 feet of horizontal separation is not being provided.

There are no proposed trees in conflict with existing water and sewer mains along the east property line. Apparent conflicts are between existing trees and established utilities. Utility connections have been modified throughout the site with water lines and sewer line placed in pairs, where possible, to eliminate utility-tree conflicts. Re-design of the Row Homes now includes three points of service where there were formerly two. Service to 555 Tantra Drive was eliminated.

2. Explain how access will be provided to the existing sanitary sewer main along the east property line. Direct access by maintenance vehicles shall be provided to each manhole. The access drive shall be an all-weather surface, such as asphalt or concrete paving, adequate gravel base or turf block, and shall be capable of supporting maintenance vehicles weighing up to 14 tons. Include any proposed fence alignments in this area as part of the resubmittal too.

The sewer may be accessed by the bike path north of the road or through the rear of the property along the east side. There will also be a new manhole installed in the east/west street of the project and there are existing manholes in Table Mesa and at the south property line shared with the City.

3. As mentioned in the concept plan comments, on-site and off-site water main and wastewater main construction per the City of Boulder *Design and Construction Standards* (DCS) as necessary to serve the development, as well as perpetuate the overall system, will be required. All proposed public utilities for this project shall be designed in accordance with the DCS. A Utility Report per Sections 5.02 and 6.02 of the DCS will be required at time of Site Review or Preliminary Plat application to establish the impacts of this project on the City of Boulder utility systems. Provide the utility report with the required revision.

A preliminary Utility Report is provided.

Zoning Karl Guiler, Case Manager, 303-441-4236

Lot size

1. To confirm the gross and net size of the site, an official survey or a letter from a certified surveyor will be required.

A stamped and signed Survey for the Armory has been provided.

2. Clarify the location of the front property line along Table Mesa.

A stamped and signed Survey for the Armory has been provided. The north property line is located in the (approximate) middle of Table Mesa Drive. An easement is reserved by the City of Boulder for the drive lanes and the sidewalk along the south side of Table Mesa. The ROW line for Table Mesa follows the back of existing sidewalk.

3. Include the assumed property lines for the RL-1 area if no subdivision occurs. As RL-1 does not permit zero lot line development, the proposed design that shows buildings at the edge of building sites should be revised so that future development or additions can be implemented consistent with a development that includes typical subdivided lots. Alternatively, submit a preliminary plat to subdivide the lots. Staff would be open to reduced lot

sizes as long as the lots sizes are generally consistent with surrounding development and if ultimately zoned RL-1, the density is not exceeded for that area.

Since the Armory is planned as a condominium project, on one lot, subdivision of the site is not planned and not possible in the future.

The size of the Single Family sites has not changed from the previous submittal for Site Review. With the addition of the 48 foot wide right-of-way in front of the single Family Homes, with the right-of way measured 6 inches from the back of walk, the net site area for a single family unit would be a minimum of 5,843 sq. ft. A detailed Site Plan, for a typical single family unit, is shown on the drawings to indicate the possible lot size if the project was ever subdivided. The dimensions of the home, site and building set backs are shown. As previously designed, the single family site was measured to the center of the street, or private road at that time, and these met the 7,000 sq. ft. lot size. When the public street was requested, the staff agreed that the dedication of rights-of-way would not further reduce density, as long as a smaller lot size was not used to increase density. The proposal remains the same with 9 single family detached units. The proposed single family sites would provide maximum south facing private yard space for each unit if we allow a "zero lot line" fence location adjacent to the north wall of the garage. While this is the recommended fence location between house sites, if the land was ever subdivided in the future, the fence will be placed 10 feet north of the garage.

Rezoning (and associated BVCP land use designation change)

The proposed development of a variety of 43 housing units would not be compatible with the current zoning and would require a rezoning on the property. A rezoning can only be approved if at least one of the criteria for a rezoning under Section 9-2-18(e), B.R.C. 1981 can be met. As stated in Section 9-2-18(e), B.R.C. 1981, *"the rezoning of land is to be discouraged and allowed only under limited circumstances."* Staff has preliminarily reviewed the criteria and finds that there would be limited opportunities for granting a rezoning, since 1) there was no clerical error in the initial zoning, 2) there was no mistake in the initial zoning, 3) the applied zoning did not ignore natural characteristics of the site, 4) the surrounding environs are not changing at an unanticipated degree, and 5) no unanticipated community need would be fulfilled by the a rezoning to a greater density. Therefore, a rezoning would only be likely based on the applicant demonstrating *"by clear and convincing evidence that the proposed rezoning is necessary to come into compliance with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan map."*

In this case, rezoning to medium density residential would not necessarily bring the zoning into compliance with the existing "Public" BVCP land use designation. Nevertheless, staff understands it is appropriate to change the BVCP land use designation on the site, since the site would no longer function as a public entity. Consequently, to request density greater than low density residential, the underlying zoning, the applicant has argued that a BVCP land use designation change to medium density residential would be consistent with the BVCP.

Staff agrees it may be appropriate to increase density on the site, since BVCP policies encourage concentrating density along multi-modal corridors and proximate to transit. In this case, Table Mesa has high bus frequency and the Table Mesa bus station is within walking distance of the subject site. Further, the project would be a compact, infill development with a diversity of housing types that are near established amenities. Lastly, staff sees potential in the fact that the site is immediately adjacent to existing medium density zoning. Staff will reserve concluding on the rezoning until such time as revisions are submitted, which may or may not enhance the project's consistency with BVCP policies. Once review is completed, staff will formulate a recommendation to Planning Board and City Council.

The written statement that addressed the BVCP Criteria is re-issued below, as written with the first application for Site Review.

Criteria for Eligibility for Comprehensive Plan Changes

A change to the land use designations shown on the Comprehensive Map shall meet the following criteria:

(a) The proposed change is consistent with the policies and overall intent of the comprehensive plan.

The Armory Project has been determined to be compatible with the policies of the comprehensive plan, including but not limited to the following:

- **Provide a diversity of housing options and sizes with 20% affordable units on site.**
- **Provide energy efficient housing that is attractively designed, compatible with the neighborhood and a sensitive infill development**
- **Create a neighborhood that supports pedestrian friendly activities on site**
- **Provide pedestrian connections throughout the neighborhood to transit corridors and a large neighborhood park**
- **Provide more housing within the established city limits which helps offset the Jobs/Housing imbalance**
- **Provide increased housing density adjacent to transportation corridors**
- **Establish a transition zone between two different housing districts and between single family neighborhoods and established commercial uses**

- (b) The proposed change would not have significant cross-jurisdictional impacts that may affect residents, properties or facilities outside the city.*

The Armory project is comprised of an enclave surrounded by the City of Boulder city limits and established zoning and will not affect neighboring communities.

- (c) The proposed change would not materially affect the land use and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan.*

Since the Armory is located in an established area of Boulder, surrounded by existing development, there would not be an impact on adjacent lands that have already developed in a pattern consistent with the comprehensive plan. The Public designation is no longer needed since the Armory has closed. Further, the proposed residential density is consistent with established single family development to the west and to medium density residential to the east and south. The proposed change would not materially affect the land use and growth projections as this proposal is consistent with the intended land uses along Table Mesa.

- (d) The proposed change would not materially affect the adequacy or availability of urban facilities and services to the immediate area or to the overall service area of the city of Boulder.*

The site is well served by existing urban facilities and services and the proposal will not alter this.

- (e) The proposed change would not materially affect the adopted Capital Improvements Program of the city of Boulder.*

The proposed project change is consistent with anticipated development along Table Mesa Drive based upon established land and would not affect the city's CIP program.

- (f) The proposed change would not affect the Area II/Area III boundaries in the comprehensive plan.*

The Armory lies completely within Area I and as an infill project does not affect the perimeter of the city.

Building Heights

1. It must be demonstrated that buildings on the site, especially those near 35 feet in height would not violate the 35-foot height limit, which is measured from the lowest topographic point within 25 horizontal feet of each structure. Please submit additional information to affirm this requirement. The lowest topographic point from structures must be indicated on both the site plans and elevations.

The drawings show actual building height on the 2 dimensional building elevations. A height determination for each building, combined with a detailed grading plan, using the historic 1958 contours as reference, is included with the Drawings. Final Grading of the site would be required to determine final building heights, however, the planned building heights are within allowable height for RM-1 Zoning. The final building height determination will be submitted with the Tech Doc's submittal following Site Review approval.

2. Single family home elevations indicate a maximum height of 28.5 feet. Is that the proposed maximum?

The maximum building height for the Single Family Homes is restricted by the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance "bulk - plane" limitation and will be less than allowed by RL-1 Zoning. A height determination for each building, combined with a detailed grading plan, using the historic 1958 contours as reference, is included with the Drawings. Actual building height is shown on the 2 dimensional elevations of the four model homes. The final height will need to be determined when final grading is available, however, the existing design meets the height limitations of the RL-1 Zone and the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance.

3. To assess the impact of the single family building #9's relationship to 630 and 640 South 46th Street, provide a section similar to those provided in the plan set.

A Site Section through this home and the adjacent existing neighbor has been added to the drawings. When the public rights-of-way were requested, it required a redesign of the main access street to a lower slope criteria. As a result this street section had to be depressed into natural grade by approximately 4 feet. This change in grade of the street generated more on site fill material from the street cut. That soil has been redistributed on the site to reduce trucking costs for removal. The end result is that the southwest corner of the site was the best location for redistribution of the fill material, thus raising the finished grade around single Family Home No. 9 by approximately 2 feet.

Building Floor Area and Coverage

1. It appears that the applicant has designed the homes in accordance with the pending Compatible Development standards. Nevertheless, staff requests additional information to confirm compliance with the following standards:

- a. Front porch standards including the exemption for coverage.

Front porches meet the requirements of Section 9-7-4, Setback Encroachments for Front Porches, and do not exceed 150 sq. ft. of porch floor area where it extends into the front yard set back. None of the porches extend more than 8 feet into the front yard set back. Some model homes incorporate a full width roof, that matches the depth of the front porch, except the driveway extends to the garage below this roof. The wider roof does not indicate a wider porch, as this additional roof was designed to shade the garage door and make it more visually recessive along the streetscape and meet Staff's request to minimize the visual impact of garage doors. The full width roof element, extending into the front yard set back, is requested for two of the model homes.

- b. Wall articulation requirements.

None of the side yard exterior walls of the Single Family Homes exceeds 40 feet in length, the point at which exterior wall articulation is required by the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance.

- c. Virtual floors.

None of the vaulted areas of the Single Family Homes incorporates a vaulted space that exceeds 16 feet in height, the height where is vaulted space is considered a "virtual floor", and therefore additional square footage.

- d. Dormer height.

Further, as staff has indicated to the applicant, it must be demonstrated that the floor area and general requirements for the single-family homes would be calculated on building site excluding any access drive or sidewalk areas. This is to ensure that the scale of development on the individual lots/building sites would not exceed what would be afforded to other single-family lots in the vicinity that would not be able to use areas in the public right-of-way to their benefit.

For the Compatible Neighborhood compliance study, an assumed "lot size" has been shown for a typical single family unit. None of the public right-of-way was used to determine the allowable square footage of the home or the maximum lot coverage allowed. The Compatible Neighborhood study, included with the drawings, shows the maximum square footage allowed for the Net Lot Area, not including the street ROW. The maximum Lot Coverage is also determined. The proposed "future property lines" are assumed where they would be located, in compliance with the Compatible Neighborhood Ordinance.

2. Please be advised that should basements or partially exposed lower levels be considered for the single family dwellings, the basements or lower levels would count as floor area per section 9-8-2(e)(1), B.R.C. 1981 if the basement or lower level is more than 2 feet above grade at any point. Please also be advised that if basements are included and ultimate zoning is RM-1, basements would be included in the total floor area calculation. Please review the section above for compliance and also be advised that the regulation may be subject to change through the proposed Compatible Development regulations.

Per Section 9-8-2(e)(1) B.R.C. 198, none of the Single Family units would exceed the limit of 2 feet of exposed foundation wall. Therefore, any Single Family basement area would not count towards the maximum floor area limit.

Basements are not planned for the Row Home buildings. Basements may be offered at the Paired Homes. If these are offered, they will be very limited in size as they will not extend below the garage. The Paired Home basement can be as large as 536 sq. ft. A Summary of Building Areas is included with the Drawings and it includes projected net basement areas for the Single Family Homes and the Paired Homes.

Building Setbacks

1. The following setback modifications have been identified:

- ✓ 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- *Reduction of 20-foot front yard setback along Table Mesa to 15 feet.*
- ✓ 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- *Parking within the required 20-foot landscaped setback.*
- ✓ 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- *Option A, SFD 15-feet from rear lot line where 20 feet required.*
- ✓ 9-7-1, B.R.C. 1981- *Encroachment of deck into rear setback- 13 or 14 foot distance proposed.*

**Add the following: Section 9-7-1: Front yard or side yard set back to a street right-of-way.
Section 9-7-1: Rear yard set back to a property line behind the Paired Homes.**

2. On both site plans, include minimum setback dimensions of any buildings within 25 feet from the property lines.

Only one Site Plan is moving forward for review and approval from the Planning Board. Set backs from streets or proposed ROW's to the buildings and to the upper level decks are shown on the Site Plan.

3. Please be advised that no accessory structures would be permitted within 55 feet from the front property line. Is it anticipated that accessory structures would be built on the property?

Accessory buildings are proposed for the Community Gardens which incorporates a trellis structure around the recycled Flag Pole. This trellis structure, in the Gardens will be located within the 55 foot set back to the Table Mesa property line. The developer would like to incorporate the trellis structure with the existing flag pole, therefore the location lies within the set back. If this variation from the Land Use Regulations is not acceptable, the trellis will be removed from the project. The mail kiosk, located at the east side of the central open space, meets this set back limitation.

4. Indicate exact setback of SFDs from back of sidewalk. Indicate setbacks of duplexes with 25 feet of back of sidewalk.

Set backs have been added to the Site Plan.

5. On the 'Single Family Detached Site Plan' revise porches to comply with the porch encroachment standards of section 9-7-5. Also, clarify whether the homes would have a 25 foot or 20 foot setback as the site plan conflicts with the master site plan.

Proposed porches for the Single Family units will not project more than 8 feet into the approved front yard set back. The Detailed Single Family Site Plan, shown on the drawings, clarifies the proposed set backs. A variance has been requested for the front yard set back, as it varies in front of the Single Family Homes. The front yard set backs are shown on the Site Plan.

Development Standards

1. Please be advised that a modification to section 9-9-2(b), B.R.C. 1981, which limits the site to only one principal building, would be required.

Comment acknowledged.

Parking

1. It appears that the minimum dimension of 19 feet would not be met for the Paired Homes #1. Please revise or demonstrate that the requirement is met.

The depth of the driveway was compromised when the stepped garage front was added to help mitigate the scale of the garage doors. The doors were separated into two 9 foot wide openings with a 2 foot step in the front wall. The driveway depth in front of these five garage doors is set at 18 feet to the back of walk. All other drive ways meet or exceed the preferred depth of 19 feet.

2. For Options A and B, at least four handicapped accessible parking spaces are required. Designate the locations of the spaces and demonstrate compliance with section 9-9-6(d)(2)(C), B.R.C. 1981.

It was confirmed, based upon Colorado State Fair Housing Act, that only one accessible space is required for the Row Home portion of the site. It is assumed that the accessible space would be provided in a grade level garage, with the second parking space for the unit relocated to the east side of Row Home No. 11.

Open Space

1. MR-1 zoning requires 3,000 square feet of open space per unit. Therefore, 41 units would result in a total requirement of 123,000 square feet of open space meeting the standards of Section 9-9-11 of the Land Use Code or 84,000 square feet of open space meeting the standards of section 9-9-11 of the Land Use Code. Staff has reviewed both Options A and B and confirms that the open space requirements are met.

For the 37 units proposed, Open Space shall be a minimum of 111,000 sq. ft. The Armory provides over 113,000 sq. ft. of grade level Open Space and therefore exceeds the minimum. The surface area of the detention pond at 555 Tantra Drive has been subtracted from the Open Space available, due the depth of this structure.

2. Confirm that drive aisles will be separated from a sidewalk by a curb.

This condition has been removed from the Site Plan.

Outdoor Lighting

Please note that development of the lot will require compliance with section 9-9-16, Outdoor Lighting. A photometric plan will be required at time of Technical Documents to determine compliance.

Comment acknowledged.

Signs

Please note that any signs on the lot must comply with section 9-9-21, Signs. Separate sign permits will be required before the erection of any signs.

Comment acknowledged.

Solar Access

1. It appears that the single family homes and paired homes would comply with the solar regulations. However, the height shown on the shadow analysis table appears to be two feet lower in some cases than the maximum heights shown on the elevations. The table should be revised to show conditions that would be considered "worst case scenario" to show that all examples will ultimately comply. This should include depicting the paired housing closer the eastern property line since half of the units along the east side would be located within 20 feet of the lot line rather than the nearly 30 feet shown.

The Detailed Shadow Analysis for Paired Homes along the east property line are correct for the building set back, building height and solar fence Solar Access Area II as shown on the drawings. The dimensions on the Building Elevations do not match the exact points used in the Shadow Study.

Occupancy of Dwelling Units

Please note the occupancy limits set forth in Section 9-8-5. **Comment acknowledged.**